Name of dataset or data source:	Assessment of Lowland Grassy Woodland, Brogo Wet Vine Forest And Dry Rainforests of The South East Forests TECs on NSW Crown Forest Estate
Custodian of the dataset or data source:	Chief Environmental Regulator (EPA)
Description:	Indicative map for Lowland Grassy Woodland: The indicative map for Lowland Grassy Woodland was constructed to resolve long-standing issues surrounding its identification, location and extent within the NSW State Forest estate covered by the eastern Regional Forest Agreements. The determination of Lowland Grassy Woodland was reviewed by the project's Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) Reference Panel (the Panel), and a set of diagnostic parameters for the identifying the Lowland Grassy Woodland TEC was agreed upon. Using these diagnostic parameters, we sampled candidate areas from existing vegetation maps to identify potential areas of Lowland Grassy Woodland occurrence in 296 000 hectares of State Forest and undertook additional mapping work using two independent mapping methods. Random Forest models (predictive habitat models) were generated using plot data and a selection of environmental variables. Aerial photo interpretation targeted stands of forests dominated by Eucalyptus tereticornis to refine the potential boundaries of Lowland Grassy Woodland. We tested whether Lowland Grassy Woodland was present in State Forest by completing systematic plot surveys within mapped areas indicating potential presence. We compared our collected data to a large regional pool of plot data that contained a subset of plots assigned to vegetation map units cited in the determination for the Lowland Grassy Woodland TEC (see Gellie 2005, Tozer et al 2006, and Keith and Bedward 1999). Our analysis of data confidently assigned only a few plots in State Forest to Lowland Grassy Woodland (2/43). From these results, we were unable to construct an operational map for Lowland Grassy Woodland. The relationship between the existing mapping cited in the determination and the plot data on State Forest was not strong enough to be a reliable basis for mapping the TEC. We also found that Eucalyptus tereticornis could not reliably be used as an indicator of Lowland Grassy Woodland in State forests. As a result, we were unable to map this TEC from the few confirmed sampling points without including a significant area of forest that was highly unlikely to be Lowland Grassy Woodland. However, we created indicative maps of Lowland Grassy Woodland by merging our predictive and API maps to provide an indication of the likely extent of Lowland Grassy Woodland in State Forests. Operational map for Brogo Wet Vine Forest: The operational map for Brogo Wet Wine Forest (BWVF) was constructed to resolve long-standing issues surrounding its identification, location and extent within the NSW State Forest estate covered by the eastern Regional Forest Agreements. We assessed whether BWVF was likely to be present in more than 296 000 hectares of State Forest in the South-east Corner Bioregion. The project's Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) Reference Panel (the Panel) preceded the assessment process by reviewing the determination for BWVF and reaching an agreed interpretation of floristic, environmental and distributional characteristics. The Panel found that BWVF is primarily defined by a source vegetation community derived from quantitative floristic plot data (Keith and Bedward, 1999), with additional defining characteristics relating to bioregion and elevation. The Panel's interpretation resulted in the identification of all State Forests located below

an elevation threshold of 550 metres within the South East Corner Bioregion as potentially containing BWVF. We identified other potential areas of BWVF by overlaying the cited vegetation maps and any State Forest mapping where vegetation was dominated by or includes Eucalyptus tereticornis (a defining species of BWVF). Within these state forests, we used aerial photo interpretation (API) to identify and delineate potential areas of BWVF based on structural characteristics and overstorey and understorey attributes, namely dominance or inclusion of Eucalyptus tereticornis. We then compiled floristic plot data for all State Forest areas within our study area. The floristic plot data was sourced from both existing flora surveys held in the OEH VIS database and from targeted flora surveys conducted specifically for this project. We used multivariate analysis to compare plots assigned to vegetation communities identified as BWVF in the determination to all other plots in the study area. We used explicit membership thresholds to identify whether plots in State forests and elsewhere belonged to one or more of the communities listed in the BWVF determination. We used the plot assignments to candidate BWVF to develop a predictive presence and absence Random Forest statistical model. The model generates a probability of occurrence of BWVF for each grid cell using plot data and a selection of environmental and remote-sensing variables. We constructed our operational map using the API line work in combination with the floristic plot data and our predictive habitat models to identify and map the locations and extent of BWVF. Our mapping identified six small areas of Brogo Wet Vine Forest totalling 17.5 hectares. All areas were within Bodalla State Forest and were located on the exposed lower slopes of Mount Dromedary.

Operational map for Dry Rainforest of the South East Forests:

The operational map for Dry Rainforest of the South East Forests (Dry Rainforest) was constructed to resolve long-standing issues surrounding its identification, location and extent within the NSW State Forest estate covered by the eastern Regional Forest Agreements. The determination of Dry Rainforest was reviewed by the project's Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) Reference Panel (the Panel), and a set of diagnostic parameters for the identifying the Dry Rainforest TEC was agreed upon. Using these diagnostic parameters, we sampled candidate areas from existing vegetation maps to identify potential areas of Dry Rainforest occurrence in 296 000 hectares of State Forest and undertook additional mapping work using two independent mapping methods. Random Forest models (predictive habitat models) were generated using plot data and a selection of environmental variables. Aerial photo interpretation targeted stands of forests dominated by Ficus rubiginosa to refine the potential boundaries of Dry Rainforest. We tested whether Dry Rainforest was present in State Forest by completing systematic plot surveys within mapped areas indicating potential presence. We compared our collected data to a large regional pool of plot data that contained a subset of plots assigned to vegetation map units cited in the determination for the Dry Rainforests TEC (see Keith and Bedward 1999). Our analysis of data confidently assigned only a few plots in State Forest to Dry Rainforest (2/21). From these results, we were able to construct an operational map for Dry Rainforest. We identified six small patches of Dry Rainforest but only one patch was located within the study area. This patch was located in Towamba State Forest and was 0.53 hectares.

Operational TEC Mapping have been derived by API at a viewing scale between 1-4000 using ADS40 50 cm pixel imagery and 1 m derived LIDAR DEM grids for floodplain EECs.

Indicative TEC Mapping have been generated from best available composite environmental data layers -

standardised to 30 m pixels.

Data quality rating:	★Institutional Environment - 4 ★Accuracy - 4 ★Coherence - 4 ★Interpretability - 4 ★Accessibility - 5

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT — Very Good ★

✔ Does the information have the potential to enhance services or service delivery?

✔ The following governance roles and responsibilities for this asset are clearly assigned:

- Information Asset Owner
- Information Asset Custodian
- Information Steward

✔ Data collection is authorised by law, regulation or agreement

✔ The Custodial agency has no commercial interest or conflict of interest in the data

✗ The data aligns with the Data Quality Framework, including:

- Legislation
- Policies
- Information Asset Governance
- Standards
- Data Management Plans

ACCURACY — Very Good ★

✔ Data has been subject to a data assurance process (for example: Checking for errors at each stage of data collection and processing, or verifying data entry and making corrections if necessary.)

✔ There are no known gaps in the data or if there are gaps (for example: non-responses, missing records, data not collected), they have been identified in caveats attached to the dataset.

✔ No changes have been made or other factors identified (for example: weighting, rounding, de-identification of data, changes or flaws in data collection or verification methods) that could affect the validity of the data; or any changes/factors have been identified in caveats attached to the asset.

✔ The data collection met the objectives of the primary user. The data correctly represents what it was designed to measure, monitor or report.

✗ Data is revised and the revision is published if errors are identified

COHERENCE — Very Good ★

✔ Standard definitions, common concepts, classifications and data recording practices have been used.

✔ Elements within the data can be meaningfully compared.

✔ This data is generally consistent with similar or related data sources from the same discipline

✔ The data does not form part of a collection or, if it is the latest in a series of data releases, there have not been any changes in methodology or external impacts since the last data release.

✗ The data can be analysed over time (for example, there have not been any significant changes in the way items are defined, classified or counted over time).

INTERPRETABILITY **Very Good** ★

✔ Information is available about the primary data sources and methods of data collection (e.g. instruments, forms, instructions).

✔ Information is available to help users evaluate the accuracy of the data and any level of error

✔ Information is available to explain concepts, help users correctly interpret the data and understand how it can be used

✔ Information is available to explain ambiguous or technical terms used in the data

✗ A data dictionary is available to explain the meaning of data elements, their origin, format and relationships

ℹ Find out more about the data dictionary from the Custodian (contact details below).

ℹ Find out more about the primary data sources and methods of data collection from the Custodian (contact details below).

ℹ Find out more about concepts used in this dataset and how to understand or interpret the data from the Custodian (contact details below).

ℹ Find out more about ambiguous or technical terms used in the data from the Custodian (contact details below).

ACCESSIBILITY **Excellent** ★

✔ Data is available online with an open licence

✔ Data is available in machine-processable, structured form (e.g. CSV format instead of an image scan of a table)

✔ Data is available in a non-proprietary format (e.g. CSV, XML)

✔ Data is described using open standards (e.g. RDF, SPARQL) and persistent identifiers (URIs or DOIs)

✔ Data is linked to other data, to provide context (e.g. employee ID is linked to employee name or species name is linked to genus)

incurred by you as a result of:

- any error, omission or misrepresentation in the information provided
- without limiting the above, any delay, failure or error in recording, displaying or updating information, including but not limited to, data relating to credit holdings.

Custodial agencies and the State of New South Wales disclaim all responsibility and all liability (including without limitation, liability in negligence) for all expenses, losses, damages and costs you might incur as a result of the information being inaccurate or incomplete in any way, and for any reason.

For more information about this dataset or data source, contact:	Environment Protection Authority (EPA)
Data Broker email:	N/A
Data Broker phone:	N/A

Understanding the Data Quality Statement

The data quality statement aims to help you understand how a particular dataset could be used and whether it can be compared with other, similar datasets. It provides a description of the characteristics of the data to help you decide whether the data will be fit for your specific purpose.
The Data Quality statement is prepared by the data custodian (provider of the dataset), using a questionnaire that has been developed in accordance with the NSW Government Standard for Data Quality Reporting.
About the quality rating:
The reporting questionnaire asks five questions for each of these data quality dimensions:

- Institutional Environment
- Accuracy
- Coherence
- Interpretability
- Accessibility

For each question: “yes” = 1 point; “no” = 0 points
The number of points determines the Quality Level for each dimension (high, medium, low).
Only dimensions with four or five points receive a star.

Points	Quality Level	Star / No Star
0	Poor	No Star
1	Poor	No Star
2	Fair	No Star
3	Good	No Star
4	Very Good	Star
5	Excellent	Star

Evaluating data quality

Quality relates to the data's “fitness for purpose”. Users can make different assessments about the dataquality of the same data, depending on their “purpose” or the way they plan to use the data.
The following questions may help you evaluate data quality for your requirements. This list is not exhaustive.Generate your own questions to assess data quality according to your specific needs and environment.

- What was the primary purpose or aim for collecting the data?
- How well does the coverage (and exclusions) match your needs?
- How useful are these data at small levels of geography?
- Does the population presented by the data match your needs?
- To what extent does the method of data collection seem appropriate for the information being gathered?
- Have standard classifications (eg industry or occupation classifications) been used in the collection of the data?If not, why? Does this affect the ability to compare or bring together data from different sources?
- Have rates and percentages been calculated consistently throughout the data?
- Is there a time difference between your reference period, and the reference period of the data?

- What is the gap of time between the reference period (when the data were collected) and the release date of thedata?
- Will there be subsequent surveys or data collection exercises for this topic?
- Are there likely to be updates or revisions to the data after official release?